



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
400 ... NEW ...  
Washington, DC 20590  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO	CONFIRMATION NO
09/990,389	11/23/2001	Akira Nishiyama	2001_1748A	2862

513 7590 04/21/2003

WENDEROTH, LIND & PONACK, L.L.P.  
2033 K STREET N.W.  
SUITE 800  
WASHINGTON, DC 20006-1021

EXAMINER

SMALL, ANDREA D SOUZA

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

1626

DATE MAILED: 04/21/2003

11

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/990,389

Applicant(s)

NISHIYAMA ET AL.

Examiner

Andrea D Small

Art Unit

1626

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☐ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 March 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 1-21 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) See Continuation Sheet is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 1-6, 11-17 and 21 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- 11) ☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is: a) ☐ approved b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.  
If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.
- 12) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

- 13) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).  
a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:  
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.  
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.  
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).  
\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.
- 14) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).  
a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.
- 15) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Information Disclosure Statement(s) (P.T.O. 1447, Paper No. 1)

Other

## DETAILED ACTION

### *I. Applicant's Response:*

(a) Applicants response filed 03/12/2003 has been received and entered as paper no. 10.

### *II. Restriction/Election:*

(a) In response to the interview summary, wherein an election requirement was added to the restriction requirement in the form of an addendum, Applicants have elected to prosecute the specific compound wherein W is void and V is O and R1 is option (3). i.e, specific compound of example 88 on page 184 of the specification.

(b) Applicant did not distinctly and specifically point out the supposed errors in the restriction requirement, the election has been treated as an election without traverse (MPEP § 818.03(a)).

(c) The elected group identified:

Group XIII: Compound of claim 1 wherein V is O; W is void; R3 is as claimed; R7 is as claimed; Ra, Rb, Rc are as claimed; X is as claimed; R1 is option (3) or (4); Z is as claimed; R5 is as claimed; and R6 is as claimed.

Claims that are readable on the elected group: Parts of claims 1-6, 11-17 and 21. The remainder of claims 1-6, 11-17 and 21 and claims 7-10 and 18-20 are withdrawn from consideration as being drawn to non-elected inventions. 37 CFR 1.142(b).

### *III. Objections:*

(a) Claims 12-14 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 11. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one

Art Unit: 1626

claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

(b) Claims 15-16 are objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 1. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k). Amending said claims to method of use claims is suggested to obviate the above rejection.

(c) Claim 4 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 2. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

(d) Claim 21 is objected to under 37 CFR 1.75 as being a substantial duplicate of claim 3. When two claims in an application are duplicates or else are so close in content that they both cover the same thing, despite a slight difference in wording, it is proper after allowing one claim to object to the other as being a substantial duplicate of the allowed claim. See MPEP § 706.03(k).

(e) Claims 7-10 and 18-20 and parts of claims 1-6, 11-17 and 21 are objected to as containing non-elected subject matter. Claims 1-6, 11-17 and 21 drawn solely to the elected group as identified supra and overcoming any objections identified supra would appear allowable

Art Unit: 1626

***IV. Note to Applicant:***

IDS filed 2/25/2002 is logged as being received and entered as paper no. 6. However, the file wrapper does not contain the corresponding 1449 or references. Applicant is requested to submit a duplicate of the IDS for the file wrapper including the 1449 and references.

***V. Contact Information:***

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Andrea D. Small, whose telephone number is (703) 305-0811. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday from 8:30 AM - 7:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Mr. Joseph K. McKane, can be reached at (703) 308-4537. The Unofficial fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-7921. The Official fax phone numbers for this Group are (703) 308-4556 or 305-3592.

When filing a FAX in Technology Center 1600, please indicate in the Header (upper right) "Official" for papers that are to be entered into the file, and "Unofficial" for draft documents and other communications with the PTO that are not for entry into the file of the application. This will expedite processing of your papers.

Communications via Internet e-mail regarding this application, other than those under 35 U.S.C. 132 or which otherwise require a signature, may be used by the applicant and should be addressed to [Joseph.McKane@uspto.gov]. All Internet e-mail communications will be made of record in the application file. PTO employees will not communicate with applicant via Internet e-mail where sensitive data will be exchanged or where there exists a possibility that sensitive data could be identified unless there is of record an express waiver of the confidentiality requirements under 35 U.S.C. 122 by the applicant. See the Interim Internet Usage Policy published by the Patent and Trademark Office Official Gazette on February 25, 1997 at 1195 OG 89.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist, whose telephone number is (703) 308-1234



ALAN L. ROTMAN  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1600

Andrea D. Small, Esq.  
April 16, 2003

---

Joseph K. McKane  
Supervisory Patent Examiner  
Art Unit 1626  
Technology Center 1